

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 86-103 are now pending in this application. In the May 11, 2009, Office Action, claims 86-103 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,298,327 to Hunter (hereinafter “*Hunter*”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,660 to Eggleston, et al. (hereinafter “*Eggleston*”).

By this amendment, claims 86, 88, 92, 94, 98 and 100 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled and no new claims have been added. Following entry of this amendment, claims 86-103 will be pending in the present application. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and immediate allowance of this application.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over *Hunter* and *Eggleston*

Claims 86-103 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hunter* in view of *Eggleston*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 86

Claim 86 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hunter* in view of *Eggleston*. Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not teach, suggest, or describe each and every recitation of claim 86. As amended, claim 86 recites, *inter alia*, “the plurality of innovation disclosures comprising innovation disclosures associated with at least one innovator of a plurality of innovators for the organization and affiliates of the organization and comprising innovation disclosures associated with at least one non-employee innovator.” Support for this amendment can be found on at least page 182, line 14 of the specification of Applicants’ patent application.

Hunter describes a system that enables inventors to adequately disclose the characteristics of their invention to their technology manager and research sponsor, as well as their patent professional. *Eggleston* describes a system for providing incentive programs over a computer network in which a host may provide sponsoring companies with the capability to buy prepackaged or self-built incentive programs. Although *Eggleston* mentions incentive programs for employees, *Eggleston* does not teach, suggest or describe non-employee innovators or innovation disclosures associated with at least one non-employee innovator. Although *Hunter* discloses innovation disclosures, *Hunter* also does not describe or suggest receiving innovation

disclosures associated with at least one non-employee innovator as recited by amended claim 86. Therefore, *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not teach, suggest, or describe this recitation of amended claim 86.

In addition, *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not, separately or together, teach, suggest or describe the recitations of amended claim 86 for “tracking the disclosure gifts distributed to the at least one innovator for the organization and the affiliates of the organization,” and “tracking gifts given to the at least one innovator for the organization and the affiliates of the organization for an intellectual property asset filing, an intellectual property asset publication, and an intellectual property asset issuance.” The Office Action at page 4 concedes that *Hunter* fails to expressly disclose tracking disclosure gifts and gifts given to the plurality of innovators for at least one of intellectual property asset filings, intellectual property asset publications, and intellectual property asset issuances. Moreover, the Office Action contends that *Eggleston* discloses the creation of employee incentive programs, which include tracking/automated fulfillment of non-monetary reward distribution data. Further, the Office Action contends that the awards are issued to employees for job related activities.

Although the Office Action cites *Eggleston* to disclose the recitations set forth above, *Eggleston* makes no mention of issuing rewards to innovators for innovation disclosure filings. For argument sake, even if it is contended that *Eggleston* discloses rewarding employees for job related activities, there is no disclosure whatsoever that describes or suggests that innovation disclosure filings are considered job related activities of innovators. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach, suggest, or describe tracking the disclosure gifts distributed to the at least one innovator for the organization and the affiliates of the organization, as recited by amended claim 86. It follows then that because *Eggleston* does not disclose innovation disclosure filings as being job related activities of innovators, an intellectual property asset filing, publication and issuance stemming from the innovation disclosure filing are also not job related activities.

For argument sake, even if it is contended by *Hunter* and *Eggleston* that innovation disclosure filings are job related activities of innovators, there is no connection or link between an innovator’s job related activities and an intellectual property asset publication or intellectual property asset issuance. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not teach, suggest, or describe tracking gifts given to the at least one

innovator for the organization and the affiliates of the organization for an intellectual property asset filing, an intellectual property asset publication, and an intellectual property asset issuance, as recited by amended claim 86. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 86 is allowable over the combined teachings of *Hunter* and *Eggleston*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Independent Claim 92

Claim 92 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hunter* in view of *Eggleston*. Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not teach, suggest, or describe each and every recitation of claim 92. As amended, claim 92 recites, *inter alia*, “the plurality of innovation disclosures comprising innovation disclosures associated with at least one innovator of a plurality of innovators for the organization and affiliates of the organization and comprising innovation disclosures associated with at least one non-employee innovator.” As described above, *Eggleston* does not teach, suggest or describe non-employee innovators or innovation disclosures associated with at least one non-employee innovator. Although *Hunter* discloses innovation disclosures, *Hunter* also does not describe or suggest receiving innovation disclosures associated with at least one non-employee innovator as recited by amended claim 92. Therefore, *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not teach, suggest, or describe this recitation of amended claim 92.

In addition, *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not, separately or together, teach, suggest or describe the recitations of amended claim 92 for tracking the “disclosure gifts distributed to the at least one innovator for the organization and the affiliates of the organization,” and tracking “gifts given to the at least one innovator for the organization and the affiliates of the organization for an intellectual property asset filing, an intellectual property asset publication, and an intellectual property asset issuance.” Since independent claim 92 includes recitations similar to claim 86, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 92 is also allowable over the combined teachings of *Hunter* and *Eggleston* at least for the reasons discussed above regarding claim 86. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Independent Claim 98

Claim 98 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hunter* in view of *Eggleston*. Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not teach, suggest, or describe each and every recitation of claim 98. As amended, claim 98 recites, *inter alia*, “the plurality of innovation disclosures comprising innovation disclosures associated with at least one innovator of a plurality of innovators for the organization and affiliates of the organization and comprising innovation disclosures associated with at least one non-employee innovator.” As described above, *Eggleston* does not teach, suggest or describe non-employee innovators or innovation disclosures associated with at least one non-employee innovator. Although *Hunter* discloses innovation disclosures, *Hunter* also does not describe or suggest receiving innovation disclosures associated with at least one non-employee innovator as recited by amended claim 98. Therefore, *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not teach, suggest, or describe this recitation of amended claim 98.

In addition, *Hunter* and *Eggleston* do not, separately or together, teach, suggest or describe the recitations of amended claim 98 for tracking the “disclosure gifts distributed to the at least one innovator for the organization and the affiliates of the organization,” and tracking “gifts given to the at least one innovator for the organization and the affiliates of the organization for an intellectual property asset filing, an intellectual property asset publication, and an intellectual property asset issuance.” Since independent claim 92 includes recitations similar to claim 86, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 98 is also allowable over the combined teachings of *Hunter* and *Eggleston* at least for the reasons discussed above regarding claim 86. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 87-91, 93-97 and 99-103

Claims 87-91, 93-97 and 99-103 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hunter* in view of *Eggleston*. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 87-91, 93-97 and 99-103 are allowable because they include recitations not taught by the cited references and because these claims depend from allowable independent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

/Shabbi S. Khan/

Date: November 11, 2009

Shabbi S. Khan
Reg. No. 61,884

AT&T Legal Department
Attn: Patent Docketing
One AT&T Way
Room 2A-207
Bedminster, New Jersey 07921

82866

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE